



252

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-51083-2025

Date of Decision: 16.09.2025

Ranjit Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ****Present:** Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.169 dated 28.12.2021, under Sections 406, 420 of IPC (Subsequently added Sections 21, 23, 24 of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 and Section 26(1) of the Payment and Settlement Systems Act, 2007) registered at Police Station Bhogpur, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Surjit Singh. It was alleged that the petitioner along with co-accused had allured the complainant in investing in their Company namely, MLM Company named M/s OLS Whizz Pvt. Ltd. It was alleged that the complainant started depositing his installments to the tune of Rs.2000 to Rs.3000 every month and the company initially used to sell the LED TVs, home theaters, RO, CCTV etc. However, after the month of February, 2020, they stopped even picking up the phone of the complainant.



It was alleged that as per the policy of the Company, they promised to give the gold as well but neither the gold was given nor his money was returned in lieu of his due amount, rather they started showing the digital currency on their portal which could never be used for any purpose by the complainant. It was realized by the complainant that he has been cheated by the petitioner and the co-accused for a tune of Rs.4,81,000/- and thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 09.04.2022. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. He approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 06.03.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-40284-2024 which was dismissed as withdrawn on 07.04.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order passed by this Court in **CRM-M-48230-2025** dated 04.09.2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gagandeep Singh, has been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is a habitual



offender who is involved in several other cases. He endorsed the fact that the case of petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Gagandeep Singh, who has already been granted bail by this Court. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 09.04.2022. As submitted, it is after the onset of the COVID, the company of the petitioner has not fulfilled its promises as made to its customers. The custody certificate produced would show that he has suffered an incarceration of 03 years, 01 month and 15 days as on 15.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in other cases also, however, in some of the cases he has been acquitted, in some of the cases he has undergone the sentence and in others, he is in custody. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gagandeep Singh, has already been granted bail by the Court vide order dated 04.09.2025 passed in **CRM-M-48230-2025**. Needless to say that speedy trial is the right of every accused.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and



denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

8. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in ‘**Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024**’, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

16.09.2025

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>: Yes/No</i>